1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )	
4	Plaintiff, 8:10CR248	
5	vs.	
6	) Omaha, Nebraska DIABLO S. WILLIAM, ) July 5, 2011	
7	Defendant. )	
8		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS	
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAURIE SMITH CAMP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
11		
12	A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S	
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Mr. John E. Higgins Asst. United States Attorney	
14	1620 Dodge Street Suite 1400	
15	Omaha, NE 68102	
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Glenn A. Shapiro Attorney at Law	
17	1001 Farnam Street Third Floor	
18	Omaha, NE 68102	
19		
20		
21	COURT REPORTER: Ms. Brenda L. Fauber, RDR, CRR 111 South 18th Plaza	
22	Suite 3129 Omaha, NE 68102	
23	(402) 661-7322	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,	
25	transcript produced with computer.	

```
1
            (At 1:35 p.m. on July 5, 2011, with counsel for the
 2
       parties and the defendant present, the following proceedings
 3
       were had:)
                THE COURT: We are here in the matter of the United
 5
       States versus Diablo William. It's Case Number 8:10CR248.
 6
            Will counsel please enter their appearances.
 7
                MR. HIGGINS: John Higgins for the United States.
       With me at counsel table is the case agent, FBI Special Agent
 8
       Paris Capalupo.
10
                THE COURT: Very good. Good afternoon to both of
11
       you.
12
                MR. SHAPIRO: Judge, good afternoon; I'm Glenn
13
       Shapiro present with Mr. William.
14
                THE COURT: And good afternoon to you as well.
15
                THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon.
16
                THE COURT: The matter before the Court at this time
17
       is the sentencing.
18
            The defendant entered a plea of quilty to Counts I and II
       of the indictment. There is no plea agreement in this case.
19
20
       I accepted the defendant's plea.
21
            And Mr. Higgins, have you received the presentence
22
       report, specifically the revised presentence investigation
23
       report, and the Court's tentative findings?
                MR. HIGGINS: I have, your Honor.
24
25
                THE COURT: And Mr. Shapiro, have you received those
```

documents and discussed them with your client?

MR. SHAPIRO: Judge, I did, and we did discuss them.

THE COURT: The government addressed the presentence investigation report at filing 44 indicating certain objections based upon additional information that had come to light while the defendant was on release status pending sentencing. And that is going to be what we're addressing this afternoon through an evidentiary hearing.

The defendant raised objections to the presentence investigation report as well regarding absence of acceptance of responsibility, and again the matters that the government had raised concerning alleged obstruction of justice due to the defendant's conduct or alleged conduct while awaiting the sentencing.

And in the tentative findings I noted that we would be hearing evidence this afternoon regarding the acceptance of responsibility issue and the obstruction of justice issue. These relate to paragraphs 18, 26 and 29 in the revised presentence investigation report.

So, have I fairly described the issues that remain, the acceptance of responsibility and the obstruction of justice issue, Mr. Shapiro?

MR. SHAPIRO: You have, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right?

Mr. Higgins?

MR. HIGGINS: Yes, Judge.

The United States recognizes that the underlying driver, so to speak, of the defendant's guideline calculation is career offender. And the United States' position is that he should receive a two-level enhancement or increase for obstruction. That really gets subsumed within the career offender. As I understand, there's no objection -- or no issue with respect to whether he does qualify as a career offender.

So, that said, I believe that the evidence that concerns the obstruction, I don't think that's going to affect his guideline calculation as such because it's subsumed within the career offender. Nonetheless, I think it's relevant to whether or not he's accepted responsibility. And I think it's also relevant to the Court's exercise of its discretion under 3553(a).

So, I recognize that also it's United States' burden with respect to the obstruction enhancement. It's the defendant's burden with respect to acceptance of responsibility. And so I'm willing to go first, if that's the Court's pleasure; or to respond, whichever makes the most sense. But we're prepared to go forward either way.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I think it makes more sense for the government to go first.

But Mr. Shapiro, do you have a preference?

1 MR. SHAPIRO: I agree with you, Judge. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 Mr. Higgins, then it is up to you. And even though with respect to acceptance of responsibility it's the defendant's 4 burden, you will be asked to come forward with the evidence to 5 support your position. And then we'll hear any evidence the 6 7 defendant may have, and we'll hear argument. So you may proceed with your evidence. 8 MR. HIGGINS: Thank you, your Honor. 9 United States calls Special Agent Capalupo. 10 THE COURT: If you'll come forward to the courtroom 11 deputy, she'll swear you in. 12 13 COURTROOM DEPUTY: State your full name for the 14 record, please, and spell your last name. 15 THE WITNESS: Paris Capalupo, C-a-p-a-l-u-p-o. 16 PARIS CAPALUPO, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN 17 THE COURT: You may inquire. 18 MR. HIGGINS: Thank you, your Honor. 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HIGGINS: 20 Could you tell us your full name, please, and spell your 21 Ο. 22 last name as well? 23 Paris Capalupo, C-a-p-a-l-u-p-o. Α. Who do you work for? 24 Q. 25 The FBI. Α.

CAPALUPO - DIRECT

6

- 1 Q. In what capacity?
- 2 A. I'm a special agent.
- 3 Q. Were you involved in connection with your work with the
- 4 FBI in the underlying drug investigation concerning this
- 5 defendant, Diablo William?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. And did that involve a pair of controlled buys?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. During what period of time was it that you were
- 10 conducting your investigation, approximately, concerning
- 11 Mr. William?
- 12 A. Approximately the end of March 2010 until about his
- arrest in August of 2010.
- 14 Q. I'm talking specifically concerning the drug case.
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. All right. During that period of time, did you have
- 17 occasion to see the defendant?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Were you conducting surveillance from time to time?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Saw him on at least one occasion then?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And then the defendant, was he ultimately arrested on a
- 24 | federal charge?
- A. He was, sir.

- 1 Q. Did you have contact with him at that time?
- 2 A. I did, sir.
- 3 Q. Personal contact?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. Let me direct your attention then forward in time to
- 6 March of 2011, after the time your drug investigation had
- 7 ended. Okay?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. In approximately March of 2011, did an Omaha Police
- 10 | detective contact you?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. Who was that?
- 13 A. It was Detective Jim Shields.
- Q. And what was the purpose of the contact?
- 15 A. He was discussing a robbery case. And he had information
- that a robbery had occurred and he got word that this person
- may look like Diablo William.
- 18 He ran Diablo's name, saw that I had a case against
- 19 Diablo and called me to talk about it.
- 20 Q. All right. Ultimately did you review some video that was
- 21 from the store where this purported robbery occurred?
- 22 A. I did, at Detective Shields' office.
- Q. Do you have Exhibit 6 and 7 in front of you?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. Exhibit 6, is it your understanding that is a collection

of videos from the store where this purported robbery

- 2 occurred?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 Q. And then Exhibit No. 7, are those excerpts of two camera
- 5 views from that same set of videos on Exhibit 6?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. All right. Have you reviewed, before coming to court,
- 8 Exhibit No. 7 in particular?
- 9 A. I did, sir.
- 10 Q. All right. And does it fairly and accurately depict
- 11 | what's shown on there?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- MR. HIGGINS: Offer 6 and 7.
- MR. SHAPIRO: There's no objection to 6 or 7, your
- 15 Honor.
- THE COURT: Exhibits 6 and 7 are received.
- 17 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- Q. Did you discuss with Detective Shields his investigation
- 19 of what it was he was trying to get you to identify?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you recognize any of the suspects from the video?
- 22 A. I did.
- 23 Q. Who?
- 24 A. Diablo William.
- Q. And so that we can all have a reference to which person

CAPALUPO - CROSS 9

1 it is on the video, can you give us an idea of what color top

- 2 Mr. William was wearing?
- 3 A. It was a white sweatshirt.
- 4 Q. All right. And do you remember anything about his cap he
- 5 was wearing?
- 6 A. It was a green colored cap, baseball style cap.
- 7 Q. Do you recall anything about any lettering?
- 8 A. It appeared to be Notre Dame, I think the sweatshirt was
- 9 a Notre Dame University shirt.
- 10 Q. Are you able to identify the defendant today?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. Do you see him in the courtroom?
- 13 A. Yes, sir, seated to my right wearing orange.
- 14 MR. HIGGINS: I'd ask the record reflect the witness
- 15 has identified the defendant.
- 16 THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- MR. HIGGINS: No further questions of this witness.
- THE COURT: Cross-examination?
- 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 20 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
- 21 Q. Agent Capalupo, does any of the video or still camera
- 22 show the actual assault or robbery of the individual?
- 23 A. No, sir.
- 24 Q. Are you aware of the reports generated with respect to
- 25 the robbery investigation generally?

CAPALUPO - CROSS 10

- 1 A. Yes, sir, generally.
- 2 Q. Are you aware of any witnesses that have my client
- 3 | physically striking this party involved?
- 4 A. I believe there's one witness in the report that I read,
- 5 sir.
- 6 Q. Does that one witness indicate they saw the defendant
- 7 push the person down to the ground?
- 8 A. Push or pull, something like that, down to the ground.
- 9 Q. And are you aware that Mr. Diablo William has basically
- 10 stated his two friends and this third party were in some fight
- and he went out to sort of break it up in some capacity and
- 12 that was his own involvement?
- 13 A. That's what Mr. William stated to me, sir.
- 14 Q. And aside from the one witness who said -- well, it's
- important. Did they say he saw my client strike this person
- or maybe push him to the ground, the best you recall?
- 17 A. Yeah, I'd have to look at the report, but it was either
- 18 push or strike to the ground.
- 19 Q. If I told you it was push, would you have any serious
- 20 dispute with that?
- 21 | A. No, sir, if that's what's in the report, I'll agree with
- 22 that.
- Q. Possibly consistent with separating parties who were
- 24 fighting?
- 25 A. Possibly.

CAPALUPO - CROSS 11

```
1
       Q.
            Any information that my client took the wallet or any
 2
       money from the individual that was fighting with the other two
 3
       parties?
            Not that I know of, sir.
       Α.
 5
       Q.
            Thank you, Agent.
                THE COURT: Redirect?
 6
 7
                MR. HIGGINS: None.
                THE COURT: All right.
 8
            Thank you, Agent. You may stand down.
                THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
10
                THE COURT: Any further witnesses, Mr. Higgins?
11
                MR. HIGGINS: United States calls Detective Jim
12
       Shields.
13
14
                THE COURT: If you'll come to the courtroom deputy,
15
       she'll swear you in.
16
                MR. HIGGINS: May I approach the witness stand?
17
                THE COURT: Yes, you may.
18
                COURTROOM DEPUTY: State your full name for the
       record, please, and spell your last name.
19
20
                THE WITNESS: Jim Shields, S-h-i-e-l-d-s.
                  JIM SHIELDS, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN
21
22
                THE COURT: You may inquire.
23
                MR. HIGGINS: Thank you, your Honor.
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
24
25
       BY MR. HIGGINS:
```

1 Q. Please tell us your full name and spell your last name as

- 2 well.
- 3 A. Jim Shields, S-h-i-e-l-d-s.
- 4 Q. Who do you work for?
- 5 A. Omaha Police Department.
- 6 Q. In what capacity?
- 7 A. I'm a detective in our major crimes unit.
- 8 Q. How long have you been with the Omaha Police Department?
- 9 A. Sixteen years.
- 10 Q. Your current assignment you said was with the major
- 11 crimes task force?
- 12 A. Major crimes unit.
- 13 Q. Major crimes unit, pardon me.
- 14 How long have you been in that current position?
- 15 A. Two and a half years.
- Q. And can you give us an idea of what sorts of duties you
- 17 have in your current position?
- 18 A. The main job with that unit is investigating bank
- 19 robberies. After bank robberies, it's other business
- 20 robberies. Then after that, it's serious felony crimes such
- 21 as assaults.
- 22 Q. Let me direct your attention to February of this year and
- ask were you involved in an investigation concerning an
- 24 alleged robbery?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Was that a robbery purported to have occurred on February

- 2 23 of this year?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. The victim or victims in that case, were they private
- 5 individuals or was that a business?
- 6 A. They were private individuals.
- 7 Q. All right. And are you aware of specifically what their
- 8 names are?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. All right. I'm going to refer to these two reported
- victims as Victim 1 and Victim 2, all right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell us the race and gender of the two reported
- 14 victims?
- 15 A. They were both white males.
- Q. Can you tell us what, if anything, was reported to have
- been taken and from whom?
- 19 a wallet was taken from him that contained his Nebraska
- 20 license, a credit card and also \$900 in cash.
- 21 Q. Now I realize that in your reports you list names of
- 22 victims; is that right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. For purposes of today's hearing, let's refer to the first
- person as Victim 1 and second one as Victim 2, all right?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. All right. So Victim 1 reported a wallet being taken?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. All right. Did Victim 1 also report any physical
- 5 assault?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Did you or other officers take photographs of
- 8 | specifically Victim 1?
- 9 A. Our crime -- personnel from our crime lab took
- 10 | photographs.
- 11 Q. Now, do you have a series of exhibits in front of you?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Could you flip to Exhibits 4 and 5?
- 14 A. (The witness complies.) I have them.
- 15 Q. Do you know what they are?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. What are they?
- 18 A. They're photographs of Victim Number 1 after the assault
- 19 and robbery.
- Q. Do they fairly and accurately depict what's shown on
- 21 there?
- 22 A. Yes.
- MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibits 4 and 5.
- MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to those two exhibits,
- 25 your Honor.

THE COURT: Exhibits 4 and 5 are received.

- 2 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 3 Q. Are you aware of whether this person I'm calling Victim 1
- 4 reported any particular physical injuries?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. What?
- 7 A. He sustained an orbital fracture to his right eye socket.
- 8 Q. Now this incident, did it take place at a business?
- 9 A. In the parking lot of a business.
- 10 Q. All right. What was the name of the business?
- 11 A. Tobacco & Phones 4 Less.
- 12 Q. Do you have Exhibit No. 1 in front of you?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. What is Exhibit 1?
- 15 A. A timeline of events.
- Q. And does that summarize some of the events from your
- investigation and the other sequence of events in connection
- with this reported robbery?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And have you reviewed it before coming to court --
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. -- excuse me, have you reviewed it today?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And does it appear to you to be accurate?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibit 1.
- 2 MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to 1, your Honor.
- 3 THE COURT: Exhibit 1 is received.
- 4 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 5 Q. Now, I take it you and other officers did reports in
- 6 connection with your investigation.
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Do you have Exhibit 2 in front of you?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Is that a report that you authored?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Does that summarize various aspects of your
- 13 investigation?
- 14 A. Yes, it does.
- MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibit 2.
- MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to 2, your Honor.
- 17 THE COURT: Exhibit 2 is received.
- 18 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 19 Q. And then turning to Exhibit 3, do you have that?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Is that an officer by -- excuse me, a report by another
- 22 officer?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And does it summarize portions of the investigation
- conducted by that officer?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibit 3.
- 3 MR. SHAPIRO: There is no objection to 3, Judge.
- 4 THE COURT: Exhibit 3 is received.
- 5 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 6 Q. We've heard testimony concerning a video. Are you aware
- 7 of whether or not a video was obtained from this Tobacco &
- 8 Phones 4 Less?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Is it your understanding that -- strike that.
- MR. HIGGINS: May I approach the witness?
- 12 THE COURT: You may.
- 13 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 14 Q. I've placed in front of you Exhibit 6 and 7 which have
- 15 been received in evidence.
- 16 Exhibit 6, is it your understanding that's a compilation
- of videos from the store?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And Exhibit 7, is that a pair of excerpts from the video
- 20 on Exhibit 6?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Did you meet with Agent Capalupo during the course of
- your investigation, show him video?
- 24 A. Yes, I did.
- 25 | Q. As a result of that identification, did you piece that

1 information together with any other information you had from

- 2 your investigation?
- 3 A. I don't understand the question.
- Q. Yeah, that was a pretty poor question. Let me try that
- 5 again.
- 6 Did you use the information you gained from Agent
- 7 Capalupo in conjunction with the other information you had
- 8 gained in your investigation, the photos, the video, etc.?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And are you aware of whether an arrest warrant was issued
- 11 for the defendant?
- 12 A. Yes, and there was.
- 13 Q. What was the nature of the warrant?
- 14 A. Robbery.
- Q. Was there a probable cause finding by a judge as far as
- 16 you know?
- 17 A. Yes, there was.
- 18 Q. Was the defendant arrested?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Approximately when did that happen?
- 21 A. March 9th, 2011.
- 22 Q. Let me turn your attention back to the video for a
- 23 moment, if I may.
- 24 | How many suspects were there from your investigation in
- 25 this robbery?

- 1 A. Three.
- 2 Q. What race and gender were they?
- 3 A. They were all black males.
- 4 Q. In order to distinguish them on the video, could you
- 5 describe for us the color of the top that each of them was
- 6 | wearing?
- 7 A. Yes. The first one was wearing a white Notre Dame
- 8 sweatshirt. The second one was wearing a red T-shirt, along
- 9 with a red baseball style cap. The third one was wearing a, I
- 10 guess, tan or brownish hooded jacket.
- 11 | Q. During the investigation did you yourself speak to any
- 12 purported eyewitnesses?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you speak with an individual named James Fitzgerald?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. What connection, if any, did that person have to this
- 17 store where the incident occurred?
- 18 A. Mr. Fitzgerald is an employee of the Tobacco & Phones 4
- 19 Less.
- Q. Where did Mr. Fitzgerald report that he was at the time
- 21 of the incident?
- 22 A. Initially he was in the back room doing work. He was
- 23 notified by another employee that there was a fight in the
- 24 parking lot.
- 25 Q. What did Mr. Fitzgerald report that he did?

- 1 A. He ran outside to the parking lot.
- Q. What did Mr. Fitzgerald report that he saw once he
- 3 arrived in the parking lot?
- 4 A. He observed three black males assaulting a white male.
- 5 He said specifically when he was outside that the person he
- 6 saw wearing the white sweatshirt was throwing the victim to
- 7 the ground.
- 8 Q. Okay. Was it a push or a pull or a throw, or do you
- 9 recall?
- 10 A. I recall a throw. I can refer to my reports for an exact
- 11 wording.
- 12 Q. All right. What did Mr. Fitzgerald report occurred after
- what he just saw that you related to us?
- 14 A. After the victim was thrown to the ground, the three
- 15 suspects ran to a vehicle that they arrived in that was still
- 16 parked in the parking lot.
- 17 Q. Did he report which of the three individuals, the three
- 18 | suspects, was driving?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Which one was it?
- 21 A. The person identified wearing the white sweatshirt.
- 22 Q. And then the other two also got into this vehicle?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Now, Mr. Fitzgerald, was he able to pick out or identify
- any of the three suspects from a photo lineup?

- 1 A. He was not.
- Q. Let me refer you back to Exhibit 2 again, if I may. Do
- 3 you have that?
- 4 A. Yes, I have it.
- 5 Q. Let me refer you to pages 5 and following.
- 6 A. I'm at page 5.
- 7 Q. Does your report include a timeline, so to speak, of the
- 8 sequence of events as depicted on the video?
- 9 A. Yes, it does.
- 10 Q. After the defendant's arrest, at some date thereafter,
- 11 did you have contact again with the defendant?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Actually did you interview him?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. At whose request?
- 16 A. At his request.
- 17 Q. Did anyone accompany you?
- 18 A. Special Agent Capalupo.
- 19 Q. Was that on about March 14 of this year?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And did you draft a report summarizing your interview
- 22 with the defendant?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have Exhibit 8 in front of you?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 | Q. Is Exhibit 8 a summary -- excuse me, your report

- 2 | summarizing your interview?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibit 8.
- 5 MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to 8, your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: Exhibit 8 is received.
- 7 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 8 Q. Did you also have contact with an individual at a later
- 9 date named Josh McCoy?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Was it about March 25 of this year when you had contact
- with Mr. McCoy?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. At whose request did that inter -- that contact occur?
- 15 A. At Josh McCoy's request.
- Q. How did you first learn or find out the name Josh McCoy
- in connection with this case?
- 18 A. On March 24th I received a telephone call from the
- 19 Douglas County Attorney that was handling the case, Robert
- 20 MacTaggart. He said a person had come into his office. He
- 21 identified him as Josh McCoy and said that he was admitting to
- 22 the robbery that Diablo was arrested for.
- Q. So then the next day you have contact with Mr. McCoy?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Was that at his request?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Did anyone accompany you?
- 3 A. My supervisor, along with Special Agent Capalupo.
- 4 Q. Did you summarize your contact with Mr. McCoy in a
- 5 report?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Do you have Exhibit 9 in front of you?
- 8 A. Yes, I do.
- 9 Q. Is that your report concerning the interview with
- 10 Mr. McCoy?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibit 9.
- MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to 9, your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: Exhibit 9 is received.
- 15 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- Q. Your contact with Mr. McCoy, March 25, give or take, was
- that about a month following this reported incident?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. How did Mr. McCoy look to you?
- 20 A. He was fine, no apparent injuries. He didn't seem to be
- 21 under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
- 22 Q. Did he have any lingering injuries like black eyes,
- 23 anything like that?
- 24 A. No, sir.
- Q. Did you notice any scuffs, marks on his fists, knuckles,

- 1 anything like that?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Mr. McCoy, did he give you more than one version of
- 4 events, fair to say?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. All right. The first version of events Mr. McCoy
- 7 provided to you and the others who were present, did you
- 8 believe that version?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Why not?
- 11 A. There was clear evidence that we had that shows McCoy's
- 12 statements did not coincide with the evidence that we had from
- 13 the scene.
- Q. And some of those contrasts, so to speak, between the
- evidence and what Mr. McCoy was saying, are they summarized in
- 16 your report, Exhibit 9?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Let me ask you in particular about your review of the
- 19 video and then your contact with Mr. McCoy, all right?
- 20 A. Okay.
- 21 Q. How did Mr. McCoy compare to any of the three suspects
- 22 that were shown in the videos that we've talked about, Exhibit
- 23 6 and 7?
- A. He's clearly not present in the video.
- Q. And I think it's been clear from what you've told us so

1 far that Mr. McCoy changed his story even during the interview

- 2 you had with him.
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. Is that also reflected in your report, Exhibit 9?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Let's turn our attention then to the next event, a
- 7 preliminary hearing. Did you testify at a preliminary hearing
- 8 in state court concerning this same manner?
- 9 A. Yes, I did.
- 10 Q. Was that in Douglas County District Court?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you have Exhibit 10 in front of you?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. What is Exhibit 10?
- 15 A. It's the transcript from the preliminary hearing that was
- 16 held on April 1st.
- 17 | Q. For what charge was the defendant -- let me try that
- 18 question over again.
- 19 What was the defendant charged with in connection with
- 20 | the preliminary hearing?
- 21 A. Robbery.
- 22 Q. Do you know the result of the preliminary hearing?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. What was it?
- 25 A. He was bound over for district court.

- 1 Q. On that charge?
- 2 A. Yes, on the charge of robbery.
- 3 MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibit 10.
- 4 MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to 10, your Honor.
- 5 THE COURT: Exhibit 10 is received.
- 6 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 7 Q. Now, following the defendant's arrest, do you know where
- 8 he was held in custody?
- 9 A. Douglas County Corrections.
- 10 Q. To your knowledge, has the defendant remained in custody
- since the time of his arrest in early March?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Now, did you make some attempt to listen to jail calls in
- connection with this defendant as part of your investigation?
- 15 A. Yes, I did.
- 16 Q. Are you familiar with the phone system at the Douglas
- 17 | County jail?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Can you summarize for the Court how that system works?
- 20 A. It's a computerized phone system. The inmates can make
- 21 outgoing phone calls, either collect calls, or they can have
- 22 money put on their books. And they can access their account
- 23 through their data number which is also their PIN number that
- 24 | they use to make the phone calls, when they're making the
- 25 outgoing phone calls.

1 Q. So is it fair to say there's a data or PIN number

- 2 associated with each inmate?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Now, have you made attempts in the past to listen to jail
- 5 calls in other cases with other defendants?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And in your experience, do inmates at the Douglas County
- 8 jail always use their own PIN number?
- 9 A. No, they don't.
- 10 Q. Why not?
- 11 A. There's a -- on the recording when they make an outgoing
- phone call, they're notified that the phone call is subject to
- monitoring. The inmates will often use other people's data
- 14 numbers to make outgoing calls when they think that -- or so
- they think investigators can't listen to those phone calls
- 16 that are being made.
- 17 Q. Now, did you actually make an attempt to listen to calls
- that were associated with this defendant's PIN or data number?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And were you able to listen to some calls that actually
- 21 | were associated with that PIN or data number?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. The calls that you heard under that PIN number, were they
- 24 | criminal in nature?
- 25 A. No.

1 Q. As a result of listening to those calls, did you become

- 2 familiar with what the defendant's voice sounded like?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Now I think you told us you'd also spoken with the
- 5 defendant face to face on a couple of occasions.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Did you attempt to try to locate other calls involving
- 8 the defendant from the jail that were not associated with his
- 9 PIN number?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. How could you do that?
- 12 A. We have a computer system that we can access -- when we
- want to access the phone calls, we can put in specific dates,
- we can put in the inmate's name, also their data number. We
- can also search by telephone numbers that they've called in
- 16 the past.
- 17 Q. So in this case, how did you go about trying to locate
- 18 other calls by this defendant that were not on his PIN?
- 19 A. I noted several phone numbers that he consistently
- 20 called, one being to his brother, the other being to his
- 21 girlfriend -- I suppose you want to call her a girlfriend.
- 22 So I can take those phone numbers, put them into our
- computer system and it will show every phone call that's been
- 24 made from the Correctional Center to that number.
- 25 Q. All right. So did you, in fact, find other calls not

1 under the defendant's PIN that were common to numbers the

- 2 defendant had been calling using his own PIN?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Did you listen to those calls?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Were you able to identify the defendant as a participant
- 7 in any of those calls?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. How could you tell it was the defendant?
- 10 A. Number one, his voice. There are several phone calls
- where he will call his brother, he refers to him as Bro. They
- 12 make reference to his mom.
- One phone call -- there's a call that's made, and they --
- the person that's being spoken to says "Diablo".
- 15 Q. Now during the calls that you listened to trying to
- identify the defendant, were there any references to this
- 17 | robbery that you were investigating?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Did that factor into your identification of the
- 20 defendant?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. When you had personal contact with the defendant, did he
- 23 admit being at the scene?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. But he denied being part of the robbery --

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. -- fair to say?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. During the calls that you listened to, referring to this
- 5 incident that was reported as a robbery, the person that you
- 6 believe was Mr. William, was he talking about the robbery in
- 7 | the third person, that is, "he did that" or someone else did
- 8 something?
- 9 A. He was referring in the first person, talking about
- 10 himself and the other people that he was talking to.
- 11 Q. During the calls you listened to connected to
- 12 Mr. William, did you also hear any descriptions of trying to
- avoid detection using the PIN system?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you give us an idea of what you heard?
- 16 A. There would be -- for instance, there's one phone call
- 17 saying that -- Mr. William says, I'm quoting, "This ain't on
- my shit, so it's okay," talking about the phone call.
- There's one person that says, "Don't talk about it now."
- Then again, "It's cool, I'm not on my," quote, "shit," meaning
- 21 his phone call -- or his phone time.
- 22 Q. Is that a reference to not using his own PIN?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Well, do you have Exhibit Numbers 13A through D in front
- 25 of you?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Are those a series of disks with recorded jail calls on
- 3 them?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And then also do you have an Exhibit 16 in the front of
- 6 you as well?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Is that another disk with a jail call on it?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. The originals of each of those calls that are on 13A
- 11 through D and also on 16, did you listen to them?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you identify the defendant as one of the
- 14 participants?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Are those accurate recordings?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibits 13A through D and 16.
- 19 MR. SHAPIRO: There's no objection to those, your
- Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: Exhibits 13A, B, C and D and Exhibit 16
- 22 are received.
- 23 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- Q. Do you have Exhibits 14 and 15 in front of you as well?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Is it your understanding that those are two groups of

- 2 selected phone calls that are subsets of the ones we've just
- 3 talked about?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And did you listen to those calls on Exhibits 14 and 15?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Did you initial the disk as well?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And are those accurate recordings of some selected calls
- 10 | from the larger group in the Exhibits 13A through D and 16?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 MR. HIGGINS: Offer Exhibits 14 and 15.
- MR. SHAPIRO: There's no objection to those, your
- 14 Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: Exhibits 14 and 15 are received.
- 16 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 17 Q. Now, with respect to the calls, did you also generate
- reports based on your review of the calls?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have Exhibits 11 and 12 in front of you?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. What are 11 and 12?
- 23 A. These are supplementary reports that I completed. These
- 24 | summarize all the phone calls that were offered in the
- 25 previous exhibits.

- 1 MR. HIGGINS: Offer 11 and 12.
- 2 MR. SHAPIRO: No objection to those two exhibits,
- 3 your Honor.
- 4 THE COURT: Exhibits 11 and 12 are received.
- 5 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- Q. Let me direct your attention to the latter part of May of
- 7 this year, specifically May 24 of this year, and ask, did you
- 8 check a calendar to see which day of the week that fell on?
- 9 A. May 24th was a Tuesday.
- 10 Q. And May 24, is that the same date that's referred to as
- 11 the last entry on that timeline, Exhibit 1?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Is it your understanding that there was a meeting that
- occurred that day in connection with this case?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And what's your understanding of who participated?
- 17 A. The Douglas County Attorney Robert MacTaggart, Josh
- 18 McCoy, and another person named Jerome Green.
- 19 Q. Now this Josh McCoy, is it your understanding that was
- 20 the same person that you yourself had had contact with?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know what time of day or night this meeting was
- 23 supposed to have happened?
- 24 A. I believe it was one o'clock.
- 25 Q. And what's your understanding of the purpose of that

SHIELDS - CROSS 34

- 1 meeting?
- 2 A. That Josh McCoy and Jerome Green wanted to come in and
- 3 admit to doing the robbery that Diablo was under the arrest
- 4 for.
- 5 Q. Is it your understanding that Mr. McCoy did, in fact,
- 6 give a statement during that meeting?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. And likewise Mr. Green the same?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. But as far as the details of what was discussed,
- obviously you weren't there.
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 (Off-the-record discussion had.)
- 14 MR. HIGGINS: Nothing further of this witness at this
- 15 time.
- 16 THE COURT: Cross-examination?
- MR. SHAPIRO: Yes, thank you, your Honor.
- 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
- Q. Detective, is it accurate that the party wearing the red
- 21 sweatshirt took the wallet?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know at what point during the altercation with the
- victim that that took place?
- 25 A. The victim indicates when he was on the ground. At what

SHIELDS - CROSS 35

- 1 point that was, I don't know.
- 2 Q. All right. It's true that there was some altercation
- 3 going on between the victim and the other two suspects or
- 4 defendants in this robbery/assault before Mr. William is
- 5 involved, if at all, true?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And after the victim and the two other suspects are
- 8 involved in some altercation, you see Mr. William leave the
- 9 store, go to his vehicle, and then cross back to wherever the
- 10 altercation is going on, true?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you have any information you can tell the Court with
- certainty at what point the guy in the red sweatshirt took the
- 14 wallet?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 O. You don't know if it was before or after Mr. William
- joined the group, if you will?
- 18 A. Correct, I don't know that.
- 19 Q. Who drove the vehicle, the suspect vehicle to the tobacco
- and phone store?
- 21 A. Diablo William did.
- Q. Okay. So the fact that he was the driver leaving is not
- 23 anything unusual, true?
- 24 A. True.
- 25 Q. I mean, when you drive someplace and park your car,

SHIELDS - CROSS 36

1 you're usually the one that takes it and leaves, right?

- 2 A. Usually, yes.
- Q. As far as you're aware, my client, Mr. William, has not
- 4 been charged in state court with any crime beyond the robbery,
- 5 true?
- 6 A. True.
- 7 Q. No tampering or conspiracy to produce witnesses or
- 8 anything like that, right?
- 9 A. As of -- yeah, right, not yet.
- 10 Q. When did you come into all this information about this
- 11 | conduct on the phone and everything?
- 12 A. I don't know the exact date.
- 13 Q. Approximately.
- 14 A. Late March.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- 16 A. Mid March.
- 17 Q. We're in July.
- 18 A. I'm sorry?
- 19 Q. And we're now in July?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. He hasn't been charged yet, has he?
- 22 A. No.
- Q. Are you aware of the circumstances of how Mr. William was
- 24 picked up or arrested on this state warrant?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. How?
- 2 A. He made arrangements through his -- I believe it's called
- 3 his pretrial officer through the federal court that he would
- 4 come in to speak with him on a set date and time.
- 5 Q. And they were there to then pick him up on the warrant?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Is that kind of like turning himself in?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. No? He didn't know he was going to be arrested?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. Did James Fitzgerald -- he's the victim -- one of the
- 12 victims, true? No, he's the employee, excuse me.
- James Fitzgerald, did he identify my client at the scene
- 14 at all?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Did the victim of the assault and robbery,
- identify my client as participating in any way?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Thank you, Detective.
- MR. SHAPIRO: That's all the cross, your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: Redirect?
- 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 23 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- Q. I'd like to ask you, Detective, about one topic that you
- were just questioned about, and that is, specifically about

- 1 there being an altercation before the defendant got involved.
- 2 Do you recall being asked about that?
- 3 A. Yes.

Q. I'd like to flesh that out a little bit, if I may, about the defendant being involved.

From your investigation, was there any involvement by this defendant that preceded the physical assault that started with these other two individuals, the person in the gray and the person in the red?

- A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Describe for us what that is.
  - A. My investigation showed that the two victims were making a purchase inside the Kwik -- or inside the Tobacco & Phones 4 Less. Diablo William is seen on the video walking up behind the two victims. They're paying for merchandise at the cash register. And Victim Number 1 pulls out a wallet which contains \$900 in cash. He described these being mostly 20s and a few 10s. So it was a large wad of money.

Diablo William is seen on videotape looking -- walks up directly behind the victim, looks over his shoulder and into his wallet.

Within ten seconds, he goes back out to the vehicle that he arrived in where the other two suspects are at. He's seen at the passenger -- front passenger door.

Then he goes back in the Kwik Shop -- back into the

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

Tobacco & Phones 4 Less. The victims are walking out as

Diablo is walking back in so they're passing each other.

The victims walk behind the vehicle that Diablo was driving. And within five seconds of them passing the vehicle, that's when the two other occupants of the Ford Escape get out. And they walk to the east area of the parking lot, out of the camera view, and that's where the assault and robbery takes place.

- Q. Now, the vehicle that the defendant and these other two individuals arrived in and leave in, how is it parked in relation to the front of the store?
- 12 A. It was parked directly in front of the store. It was
  13 backed into a parking stall.
- Q. Now, from the video, you said that you could see

  Mr. William reentering the store and these two victims walking

  out more or less simultaneously.
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. From one of the video shots, can you actually see a reflection of inside the store?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you see at that moment you're talking about what the defendant -- excuse me, what the victims are doing, that is, walking?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. All right.

- 1 A. You --
- 2 Q. That moment you're talking about when they pass one
- 3 another inside the store, Mr. William, are you able to see
- 4 what he does in the reflection?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 0. What does he do?
- 7 A. He looks at the victims as they pass. He stops -- pauses
- 8 and turns behind his shoulder to look to where the vehicle was
- 9 in the parking lot and where the victims were going behind the
- 10 vehicle.
- 11 Q. So passing one another, Mr. William, there's a pause and
- 12 he looks back over his shoulder in the direction of the
- 13 victims; fair to say?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. All right. And this is after having gone out to the
- vehicle and having contact with the passenger side that you
- 17 just described?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Then Mr. William, can you see him on the video apparently
- 20 making a purchase?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. What do you see Mr. William do, if anything, while he's
- 23 making that purchase?
- 24 | A. He's obviously paying for the merchandize. But while
- he's doing that, he's also looking back over his shoulder, out

- 1 the window to where the vehicle is and also to the east.
- 2 There's windows along the whole front of the store, also to
- 3 the east of where the vehicle was where the assault is taking
- 4 place at that time.
- 5 Q. Okay. You could see him looking in that direction?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And you were just telling us about the windows in the
- 8 store, and I should have asked you that.
- 9 From the counter where Mr. William made the purchase, can
- one see -- is there a view of where the victim's vehicle was?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Is the victim's vehicle -- is that the general location
- of where the assault and robbery occurred?
- 14 A. Yeah, to the east of the vehicle in the same parking lot.
- 15 Q. Okay. Visible from the location where Mr. William was?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And then I think you told us that the vehicle parked in
- 18 | front of the store was backed in --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- is that right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. The victims, when they walked, did they walk in front of
- 23 this truck that's backed in or do they walk behind this truck
- 24 | that's backed in?
- 25 A. They walk behind the truck, between the truck and the

- 1 building, on the sidewalk.
- Q. From the video, do you see any physical indications on
- 3 the part of either of these reported victims that they're
- 4 having any contact or interaction of any kind with the two
- 5 individuals who get out of this SUV, the red top and gray top?
- A. You can see on the video and there's no interaction with
- 7 the victims to the suspects.
- 8 0. Are the victims doing anything other than simply walking,
- 9 at least as is apparent from the video?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. Lighting up a cigarette?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Striking a match?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. Talking to anyone, turning toward anyone that you could
- 16 see?
- 17 A. No. Eyes are straight and they're walking forward.
- 18 Q. And then once those two victims passed behind this SUV,
- 19 how long does it take before these two occupants of the SUV
- 20 exit and head in the direction the victims went?
- 21 A. Within five seconds, three to five seconds.
- 22 Q. So, when you're asked about any involvement by this
- defendant prior to the time the first blow is struck, at least
- as reported to be struck by someone wearing gray or someone
- 25 | wearing red, does your investigation show any involvement by

- 1 the defendant up to that time?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. The factors you've just described for us, are those parts
- 4 of the evidence that you referred to in saying yes, he had
- 5 involvement?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 (Off-the-record discussion had.)
- 8 BY MR. HIGGINS:
- 9 Q. Let me ask you about what one can see on the video toward
- 10 | the end of the incident, all right?
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. Can you see these three individuals who had got out of
- the SUV get back into the SUV?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you describe -- I want to ask you -- I was going to
- ask you to describe the manner in which they get into the SUV,
- but you can see that on the video.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 O. The fact that these three individuals flee the scene --
- 20 MR. SHAPIRO: Object to the form. It's not done yet
- 21 but -- I'll wait until he finishes. Assumes facts not in
- 22 evidence.
- THE COURT: All right. You can rephrase now if you
- 24 would.
- MR. HIGGINS: Now is a good time to rephrase it. I

25

1 will do that, your Honor. Thank you. 2 BY MR. HIGGINS: 3 The fact that these three individuals leave the scene with such haste as is shown on the video, does that have any 5 bearing on your conclusion that the defendant's involved? 6 MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. It's pure speculation on 7 his part, and it's not relevant what he personally would think. 8 9 THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. HIGGINS: 10 What you saw on the videotape concerning the manner in 11 0. which these three individuals left, did that factor into your 12 decision to seek a warrant for the arrest of the defendant? 13 14 A. Yes, part. 15 MR. HIGGINS: Nothing further at this time. 16 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Detective. You 17 may stand down. 18 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: Any further witnesses, Mr. Higgins? 19 20 MR. HIGGINS: No, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. And any further evidence? 21 22 MR. HIGGINS: The only thing I would ask, your Honor, 23 is that the Court take judicial notice of the initial presentence report and the timing with which it was issued. 24

It's got a cover e-mail on it that reflects that it was sent

1 to counsel, that is, the original presentence report, February 2 22 of this year; and then the revised presentence report, I 3 ask you to take judicial notice of the time that was issued, which was March 17 of this year. 5 THE COURT: I will take judicial notice of those 6 facts. 7 MR. HIGGINS: Nothing further, your Honor. THE COURT: Any evidence, Mr. Shapiro? 8 MR. SHAPIRO: Evidence? No, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 Argument, Mr. Higgins? MR. HIGGINS: At this point, your Honor, are we 12 13 limiting our comments to the obstruction enhancement I'm 14 seeking and acceptance, or is this allocution overall? 15 THE COURT: Just on the objections. So it's just on 16 the obstruction of justice and the acceptance of 17 responsibility. 18 MR. HIGGINS: Yes, your Honor. With respect to the obstruction, our position is that it 19 20 is probable that the defendant obstructed justice with respect 21 to his federal sentencing. 22 And I've directed the Court's attention to various 23 segments of the calls that we've not played today, but they're in evidence, where the defendant is specifically referring to 24

the fact that he wouldn't be so worried about this robbery but

25

for the fact that it's going to be used in his federal sentencing.

What he's trying to do is manipulate his federal sentencing by manufacturing evidence, by attempting to bribe and otherwise influence witnesses. And for those reasons, we believe that this conduct that postdates, that happened after this robbery, are the grounds for a two-level obstruction enhancement.

I understand that that's subsumed within career, but those same factors, I submit, also bear on whether or not he's accepted responsibility.

With respect to that topic, I think simply a finding of probable cause by the state court is a basis on which this Court can likewise find probable cause to believe the defendant was involved in committing that robbery. Leave aside, even for the moment, the calls, although those calls do add to the probable cause -- I think much more than probable cause -- as to his involvement in the robbery itself. Why manufacture evidence if you weren't involved; in fact, it was other people who were committing this?

So that's our position with respect to those two issues.

THE COURT: Mr. Shapiro, as Mr. Higgins noted, the obstruction of justice enhancement is really subsumed in the career criminal calculation. And so, I will sustain your objection to the career -- excuse me, to the obstruction of

1 justice enhancement.

And you can argue on the issue of acceptance.

MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you.

Well, I know there's some burden on me, but we kind of did this for obvious reasons in this manner, Judge, but for purposes of trying to meet some burden or showing the hurdle the government has to overcome, I'd ask you to take judicial notice of filing number 29. That is the defendant's petition to enter a plea of guilty. Within that document he has clearly accepted responsibility. He pled guilty. There was no plea agreement, but under that document and the hearing that day he pled guilty. He admitted to the conduct for this charge.

What I find is consistent throughout most of the government's presentation here is none of these events have anything to do with this case here in federal court.

Now Mr. Higgins makes a slight statement that on one of the recordings Mr. Diablo William is concerned about the impact that this might have on his federal case and that's why Mr. Higgins thinks in part that's why he's doing this.

But I don't think it really matters under the law what he really thinks, your Honor. We're a body of men and women of law. We follow the law.

The law basically says under 3E1.1 that in determining whether he qualifies, subsection (a) the first one, if he

truthfully admitted the conduct. He did. He hasn't tried to withdraw his plea of guilty.

I think the government is going to rely probably on subpart (b) which says voluntary termination or withdrawal from criminal conduct.

But if you go through every other subpart contained in there, none of those go against the defendant. And specifically application note number 3, basically says an entry of a plea of guilty prior to trial, combined with truthfully admitting the conduct compromising [sic] the offense of conviction, some other language, will constitute significant evidence of acceptance of responsibility for this subsection.

Now, there's some language beyond that which Mr. Higgins will try to fit this is, but that is substantial evidence in his favor. There is nothing in the record that shows he has done anything to withdraw his plea of guilty, not accept the conduct here, in spite of what Mr. Diablo William may have thought on one call the government is interpreting, his conduct that you just heard about, has zero to do impact—wise with this case. Perhaps it does on some state level, but my client, as we've heard, has not been charged with any tampering or any other related conduct beyond that.

He is presumed innocent. There's a much higher standard to convicting a person in our country as you are aware than a

probable cause finding at a preliminary hearing in state court. So he still has not been convicted of the actual discharge.

But, even shading it in the government's favor, I just think under the rules as we look through them, your Honor, there's nothing he's done outside of what Mr. Higgins would put on probably subparagraph (p) -- (b) which is termination of criminal conduct that would overcome the fact that there's substantial evidence in his favor that he has accepted responsibility.

What's important to note, if you look at application note 4 which follows, conduct resulting in enhancement under 3C1.1, which you just sustained my objection to him getting, would indicate he has not accepted responsibility.

So, as you've just indicated and ruled upon, there is no obstruction here the government can point to which would affect this case. His conduct has nothing to do with this case.

He pled guilty. His filing at filing number 29 which he's not asked to withdraw clearly shows he's accepted responsibility. And in spite of the information the government has just given you, I think they fall short on overcoming what the rules say, and he gets acceptance for this case.

I'd ask you to so find.

THE COURT: Well, to be clear, my finding regarding obstruction is not that the defendant did not obstruct justice. The objection is largely moot because of the fact that it doesn't affect the guideline calculation. And I think the evidence that was presented is still something that can be considered when looking at the 3553(a) factors.

Regardless, on the acceptance of responsibility issue, I do agree that the government's case is based on application note 1(b), the question of whether the defendant voluntarily terminated or withdrew from criminal conduct or associations.

I think the credit for acceptance of responsibility is in part for the purpose of giving defendants some incentive to plead when they are, in fact, guilty so that it does conserve resources of the court and of the prosecutor's office as well as the resources of defense lawyers and witnesses and others.

But also it has an aspirational aspect. If we look at the whole concept of rehabilitation and specific deterrence and the need for isolation or incapacitation of a defendant, all of those objectives of the sentencing statute are diminished somewhat when someone accepts responsibility and turns over a new leaf and says, "Yes, I did wrong; I admit I did wrong; I plan to go straight now; I plan to follow the law."

We are hoping that that repentance means that there's not as great a need for further rehabilitation programs and

further specific deterrence and the isolation or incapacitation that is needed for the protection of society.

We're hoping all those objectives are somewhat diminished.

When someone hasn't turned over a new leaf, then that's an indication that, no, we still have the need for all of those objectives to be served.

And I often tell people who get pretrial release it's a golden opportunity to demonstrate that you have made a change. And if you obey the law, you obey the rules of pretrial release, you follow the directions of the probation officer, you get employment, you follow through with whatever counseling and therapy is directed, you meet your family obligations, those are a huge indication that you're making progress and that a sentence below the guideline range may be warranted.

But, on the other hand, if someone's out on pretrial release and that person demonstrates that he's not staying out of trouble, he's in the association of people who are going to get him into trouble or he can't obey the law or follow the directions of the probation office, then that also is going to be taken into consideration.

And here, I recognize it's actually the defendant's burden to show that he is entitled to acceptance of responsibility. And I appreciate the fact he pled guilty and saved the Court resources of going to trial.

But here the government has actually more than met its burden, to the extent it has any, in that the government has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant was involved in continuing criminal activity. And that, in my opinion, means that the defendant has not accepted responsibility under the letter and the spirit of the guideline.

So, I will deny the objection regarding acceptance of responsibility.

The advisory guidelines are as follows: Base offense level under section 2D1.1(a)(5)(C)(8) is level 24. The adjusted offense level is level 24. And we're talking about both counts here at this point in time that are grouped, for a total offense level of 24.

We then apply the Chapter Four enhancement because of the defendant's status as a career offender, and the level is 34.

The defendant's criminal history category is category VI.

The guideline provision for Counts I and II each is 262 months to 327 months. The supervised release range is four to five years. Probation is not authorized. The fine range is \$17,500 to \$2 million.

There's a notation here of community restitution in the sentencing recommendation, but that was an error. And that's not something that's recommended in this case. The special assessment mandated is \$200.

1 Mr. Higgins, did you receive the sentencing 2 recommendation? 3 MR. HIGGINS: I did, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Shapiro, did you receive that and 5 discuss it with your client? MR. SHAPIRO: I did and we did. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. And I understand that Mr. Higgins may be proposing a sentence below the -- excuse me, above the 8 lowest end of the sentencing guideline range. The probation office has recommended a sentence at the lowest end, and that 10 the terms for Counts I and II run concurrent. 11 I'll hear allocution starting with Mr. Shapiro. 12 13 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Judge. 14 I think also you'll note, there was a filing also, an 15 amended statement of position where the defendant asked the 16 Court to consider sentencing consistent with the FSA which was 17 promulgated and is in effect as of October of 2010. 18 And it makes a difference to Mr. William on some level, Judge. I believe under the current FSA, that the statutory 19 20 minimum changes. Presently as charged from the date of this 21 offense conduct which I know Mr. Higgins will point out the 22 date of his offense conduct predates it, but it was a five to 23 40.

I believe my review of the current statutory penalties

with respect to this amount of crack cocaine, under 28 grams

24

25

is a zero to 20. Mr. William thinks it's zero to five, but I think it's a zero to 20.

And under the career offender calculations, when you go there, it actually makes the base offense level a 32 as opposed to a 34.

I received some information probably within the last 24 or 48 hours that it looks like these are going to be mandated, the FSA, to be applied retroactively as of November 2011. So it's this counsel's position that we are either going to apply that to Mr. Diablo William today and those similarly situated, or we're coming back in November, if I'm correct at what I see, and we'll be making those adjustments.

Either way, I ask the Court for many reasons, all the factors and laws and rules that you have, that you consider a calculation based on the FSA. The current level 26 as of October 2010 is 28 grams to, I believe, 112 grams. That is now the required level, one ounce, to bring about a five-year mandatory minimum, the five to 40. The amount of crack cocaine at issue here certainly is below that. And I think the government acknowledges that obviously. It's in the report. It is no longer a five to 40 as we sit here. It was at the time Mr. Higgins indicted him.

So part of my allocution to this Court obviously is for you to give every consideration and break to Mr. William.

He's looking at a tremendous amount of time as is recommended

at 262 months. That's 22 years, your Honor. Two months shy, but it's 22 years. Mr. Higgins has made some overtones that he thinks it should be more than that. And I realize he has a job to do, it's his position to argue that.

But that's a long time. We're talking about 22 years in prison for less than an ounce of cocaine which the laws today as we sit here are being treated differently through Congress and the courts because we know when these guidelines were promulgated, they were unfair. They were wrong and they've been changed now.

And this defendant should get the benefit of what the current law and what all the smart people think these guidelines in crack cocaine should reflect, not the time, as Mr. Higgins will argue, the offense conduct, because it does predate the enactment of the statute. I'm aware of that.

But I think you have the authority to sentence

Mr. William at any level that you want. And I think first and

foremost, you should consider the calculation as a level 32

for the career offender. I believe that brings his guideline

range -- well, I had hoped he got acceptance on there, so it

would go to -- it's still 210 months, your Honor.

You know, that is -- you want to talk about deterrence, specific or otherwise, that's for most of the rest of his productive years anyway. And I just don't know why you have to give him more time than that.

I think the law allows it, I think the facts allow it.

His repent, the effect on his family, it's more than obvious.

And you should give this person some opportunity to have the benefit of the law as it's now being handed out to every other person in this country.

That's it.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shapiro.

Mr. William, if you want to take a moment to compose yourself, that's fine.

MALE SPECTATOR: Snap out of it, dude.

THE COURT: I want to give you an opportunity to speak when you're ready.

Mr. William, is there anything that you would like to say?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I just want to say -- I would like to apologize to my family -- my kids and my family, please, the mothers of my kids. And I'm sorry for making these mistakes. I'm sorry I'm not going to be there for you all when you all really need me.

I'd like to say to you, your Honor, that I did change and I have changed and I'm still changing. And I know that I probably shouldn't have been around whoever I was around. But at the time of the robbery when it took place, I was in the store. I didn't give no signal, I didn't do anything like that. I didn't take no money from nobody or nothing like

that.

At the time of my indictment, I was over -- off the Gulf working 90 to 120 hours a week, every day, helping clean up the oil spill. I was blessed with that job through the people of Impact One who's currently still supporting me and my change.

I know that I have made mistakes. I know that. I also know that I didn't -- I wasn't -- I'm not trying to justify what I done, but the guide -- for \$200, I'm about to be sent away from my family.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. William.

Mr. Higgins?

MR. HIGGINS: Judge, obviously what's driving this defendant's sentence is the career offender guidelines. And you have discretion obviously to depart -- to deviate from those guidelines if you so choose.

I'm not asking for an upward enhancement or upward variance from the guideline range. But I think it's important to remember that what brings the defendant here today is not the two half ounces of crack that he sold in connection with this investigation in this particular case to a CI.

We're talking about, in terms of specific deterrence, this defendant, his priors reflected in the presentence report are for distribution of controlled substances, he's done it before, and for robbery. He's been convicted of both of those

in the state system.

So in terms of specific deterrence, I submit that a sentence within at least the guideline range is an appropriate one for that 3553(a) factor.

From the sequence of events that occurred after this robbery that we've laid out in the hearing today, I think it's plain, especially if one listens to the calls, that what happens thereafter is an attempt to pervert justice, is an attempt by this defendant to manufacture evidence, to manipulate witnesses, to try to bribe and otherwise influence the reported victims in the case to his own ends, because he knew that that was going to have a bearing on his federal sentence. He's trying to manipulate the facts and the evidence that would come before this Court in connection with his federal sentence.

With respect to the Fair Sentencing Act, I agree with counsel that Mr. William's conduct predates August 3 when that statute took place. I disagree with counsel that you have the authority to overlook, to ignore, to not follow the statute that was in effect at the time the defendant committed these offenses.

Congress, as interpreted by the Eighth Circuit in particular, has indicated the Fair Sentencing Act is not retroactive. So the defendant's statutory range in point of fact is not zero to 20, it is a five to 40. And so therefore,

the presentence report is calculated accurately.

I agree with counsel that there have been an indication from the Sentencing Commission here just recently that the Sentencing Commission intends to make its guideline calculations retroactive. But of course, the Sentencing Commission has no authority to override the congressional power as reflected in the statute and interpreted by the Eighth Circuit.

So, regardless of what the Sentencing Commission does, we're still under the regime of pre August 3, 2010, the statutes and penalties that were in place at that time.

Even assuming that we weren't, and even assuming it's a zero to 20 under the new statute, the defendant's range is still 210 to 262 months. I think the Court should sentence within that range.

But I don't think that is the appropriate range. I've talked about specific deterrence. I've talked about also really general deterrence and what the defendant has attempted to do to manipulate the evidence that this Court would hear. I think that general deterrence requires a sentence within the advisory guideline range based upon that contact.

And I think for those reasons, especially the conduct that postdated the reported robbery, that separates this defendant from every other defendant who failed to accept responsibility after committing a five to 40 offense.

THE COURT: You said one thing that confused me, you said even if the statutory range were zero to 20 years, the quideline would be up to 262 months?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  HIGGINS: That's my calculation, Judge. And let me flesh that out, if I may.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HIGGINS: Under the calculation by the presentence -- by the probation office currently, under the career offender guidelines, since his sentence is -- sentencing range, the maximum, is 25 years or more, that results in a base offense level 34. That's where we are today.

Defendant is arguing for retroactive application of the Fair Sentencing Act that would affect his career offender correct. Just assume for a second that's the proper approach. I don't think it is; let's assume that it is. In that case, his underlying offense would be, hypothetical, zero to 20 years.

THE COURT: How do you get a guideline high end then of 262 months?

MR. HIGGINS: Well, zero to 20 years, I'm looking at section 4B1.1 of the guidelines, the career offender for a 20 years or more, so 20, zero to 20, 20 years or more, that results in a base offense level of 32. My reference of the guidelines anyway, it's a 32. 32, minus zero, if there's no

1 acceptance of responsibility, that means a total offense level 2 of 32. So an automatic --3 THE COURT: Maybe you're saying the high end of the guideline would be above the statutory maximum, but I couldn't 4 5 sentence above the statutory maximum. 6 MR. HIGGINS: No, of course you can't. 7 THE COURT: I just was confused that the high end of the guideline was 262, but that would be outside the statutory 8 maximum. 9 10 MR. HIGGINS: Right. 11 THE COURT: Okay. MR. HIGGINS: All right. Fair enough. 12 13 So you're right, properly stated it should be 210 to 240. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. HIGGINS: The statutory maximum. 16 THE COURT: I'm with you. 17 MR. HIGGINS: Which is, of course, binding on the 18 Court and that's what we're asking for, or would ask for but for that statutory range would be an incremental consequence 19 20 for the defendant's attempt to manipulate the evidence in this 21 court. And I would ask for -- under the guideline calculation, 22 23 what I would ask for would be 36 months on top of the 262 which would be a recommended -- a request for 298 months. 24

But, of course, that exceeds the statutory minimum -- excuse

25

me, the statutory maximum.

In this case, what I'm asking the Court to do overall since there's two counts would be to impose a sentence of 298 months, which would be the low end of the guideline range, 262, with an additional 36 months which would be an incremental consequence for his attempts to manipulate evidence.

That's my position.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Well, I don't doubt that the defendant deserves some additional consequence for his bad behavior while out on pretrial release status. And his behavior is not commendable and I don't condone it. And we're all disappointed with it, very disappointed.

Also, no one gets to a criminal history category VI without substantial criminal activity.

So, even though, Mr. William, I know you're distressed with the situation you're under, and your family is distressed, this isn't your first time in the criminal justice system. You've been in and out a lot and for very serious offenses.

Having said that, the guideline range as it exists is a very large amount of time, as Mr. Shapiro noted. We're looking at a long time for anyone to be serving in prison.

I have never sentenced anyone in anticipation of Congress

or the guideline commission taking some action in the future.

I realize it may be inconvenient for everyone if we have to come back again and go through this again after some change is made.

But as a matter of principle, I don't try to second guess or anticipate what Congress or others may do. I think that that's dangerous to do that. And it could cause me to treat different defendants inequitably. So I sentence based upon what the law is at the time of the offense and at the time of the sentencing, and not in anticipation of what may happen in the future.

Although I don't disagree with Mr. Higgins' position that some enhancement is warranted based upon the defendant's bad conduct -- and it is serious bad conduct -- because the guideline range provides for such a substantial sentence, I will sentence the defendant at the lowest end of the guideline range. And I will make that sentence concurrent for both Counts I and II.

Accordingly, I impose a sentence of 262 months on Count I and on Count II to run concurrently. I impose a sentence of three -- excuse me, five years of supervised release on Count I and Count II again concurrent, that will follow the term of incarceration.

I will not impose a fine because the defendant does not have the ability to pay and is not expected to become able to

1 pay a fine and because of the burden it would impose on his minor children.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do impose a special assessment in the amount of \$200. That's due and payable immediately. If it's not paid immediately, it will be paid through the Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Financial Responsibility Program with an allocation of 50 percent of available inmate institutional funds per quarter.

I intend to impose the special conditions of supervised release set out in the sentencing recommendation. Are there any objections to those, Mr. Higgins?

MR. SHAPIRO: None, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Shapiro?

MR. SHAPIRO: There are none.

THE COURT: The special conditions of supervised release set out in the sentencing recommendation are imposed. The standard conditions will also apply.

I recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that the defendant receive credit for time served in federal custody, not what he's serving in state custody in connection with any pending state charges.

I do recommend that he be allowed to participate in an appropriate drug treatment program.

Mr. William, you do have a right to appeal from this sentence that I've imposed. Any appeal needs to be filed within 14 days of the filing of the judgment.

When we're done with the hearing, the courtroom deputy is going to show you a form that outlines the right of appeal and explains how to file a notice of appeal.

I'd like you to read through the form and then sign the signature pad indicating that you've read the form. Signing the signature pad is not the same thing as submitting a notice of appeal.

If you have any question about whether you should appeal, you should discuss the matter with Mr. Shapiro. The ultimate decision is up to you.

Do you have any question for me about your right of appeal?

(Off-the-record discussion had.)

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: All right. The defendant is remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshal to be delivered back to state custody.

MR. SHAPIRO: One final matter, your Honor? I apologize.

Would you make recommendations for Oxford, Wisconsin? We understand it's merely a recommendation, but if he would qualify for Oxford for communication with family and travel, that would be his request, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will do that. I'll recommend to the

1	Bureau of Prisons that the defendant be given consideration							
2	for placement in its facility in Oxford, Wisconsin so that he							
3	can be near home and family.							
4	MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you.							
5	THE COURT: And he's now remanded to the custody of							
6	the marshal to be delivered back to state custody for the							
7	resolutions of those charges.							
8	Anything further, Mr. Higgins?							
9	MR. HIGGINS: No, your Honor.							
10	THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Shapiro?							
11	MR. SHAPIRO: No.							
12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.							
13	We're adjourned.							
14								
15	(Adjourned at 2:55 p.m.)							
16								
17								
18								
19	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.							
20								
21	/s Brenda L. Fauber 7-26-11							
22	Brenda L. Fauber, RDR, CRR Date							
23								
24								
25								

				0 ,				
1	I-N-D-E-X							
2								
3								
4	Direct C	Cross	Redirect	Recross				
5	WITNESSES:							
6	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:							
7	Paris Capalupo 5	9						
8	Jim Shields 11	34	37					
9	DVIIIDIMO.	0550		)				
10	EXHIBITS:  1. Timeline of Events	<u>Offe</u> 16	<u>rea</u> <u>F</u>	Ruling 16				
11	2. Omaha Police Report	16		16				
12	3. Omaha Police Report	17		17				
13	4. Photograph of Victim	14		15				
14	5. Photograph of Victim	14		15				
15	6. Video from Store	8		8				
16	7. Excerpts from Ex. 6	8		8				
17	8. OPD Report - Def. Interview	22		22				
18	9. OPD Report - McCoy Interview	23		23				
19	10. Transcript of 4-1-11 Hearing	26		26				
20	11. Supplementary OPD Report	33		33				
21	12. Supplementary OPD Report	33		33				
22	13A. Recording of Phone Call	31		31				
23	13B. Recording of Phone Call	31		31				
24	13C. Recording of Phone Call	31		31				
25	13D. Recording of Phone Call	31		31				

1	EXHI	BITS:			Offered	Ruling
2	14.	Recording of	Phone	Call	32	32
3	15.	Recording of	Phone	Call	32	32
4	16.	Recording of	Phone	Call	31	31
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						